were at full liberty to meet any one they chose and used their discretion in this matter.

A list* of the invitees is also laid on the table.

Parliamentary Delegation.

201. *Mr. K. S. Joseph: Will the Government be pleased to state:

(*a*) whether any invitations were issued by or on behalf of Government to anybody to meet the Parliamentary Delegation that visited Travancore;

(*b*) on what principle the invitations were issued;

(*c*) why leaders of parties in both Houses of legislature were not invited; and

(*d*) whether Government insisted that the members of the Delegation should be State guests?

Mr. G. Narayanan Tampi (*a*) Yes.

(*b*) Those whom the Government considered might usefully meet the Delegation were invited bearing in mind that many delegates from the State Congress had already met the Delegation at Delhi and elsewhere and put forward their contentions and allegations before them. The Parliamentary Delegation were at full liberty to meet anyone they chose and used their discretion in the matter.

(*c*) Does not arise in view of answer to (*b*).

(*d*) No; though they were treated as State guests.

Mr. K. S. Joseph: With reference to part (*b*) of my question, "why leaders of parties of both the Houses of the Legislature were not invited", the answer given is: "it does not arise". Am I to understand that Government thought the leaders of the House were undesirable?

President: Order, order, there is no question of desirability or undesirability in the matter. If time had permitted and if the Parliamentary Delegation had not decided upon spending 45 minutes for learning the affairs of Cochin State, and 16 hours for learning the affairs of Travancore, Government would have normally not only asked the leaders of parties and the members of legislature but also about a 100 or 150 people to meet them. And there was a fresh difficulty. A series of statements in the press, that the Parliamentary Delegation had declined the offer of this Government to accept their hospitality and that Retired Justice Mr. Thaliath and Mr. K. P. Abraham had been telegraphed to on the matter by the members of the Delegation and that they had

* *Vide* Appendix I—page

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[President.]

made arrangements for their stay were made with a view to discredit this Government, the hospitality of which had been extended to and accepted by the Delegation at the outset. It had been reported that all this had necessitated a certain amount of correspondence to the Government of India and that finally the Parliamentary Delegation were not going to accept our invitation. We took it for granted that the newspaper reports were true. So arrangements were deliberately not made either to receive them or to arrange for their meetings. But finally, it came out that they decided not to accept any other hospitality, but to accept the one extended by Government. We knew of it just before they started. On that basis a Tea Party was arranged by the Dewan and a general meeting was arranged in this Chamber in order that they might meet a certain number of people. In the mean time, Government got a very well publicized report from Delhi as to Miss Anne Mascrine going to meet them clandestinely. (Mr. K. S. Joseph: I protest). You may, but it was absolutely clandestine. I have used that word with the Parliamentary Delegation so that the protest may also be noted by the Parliamentary Delegation that a clandestine interview had been arranged by the State Congress with the Parliamentary Delegation which was improper. Anyway, the clandestine arrangement was made with the Parliamentary Delegation. The State Congress put forward exparte statements wholly discreditable to this Administration, not founded on facts and mainly animated by personal motives. The matter is well known in South India. Very well, for this reason this Government came to the conclusion, rightly or wrongly, that having regard to the attitude of the State Congress, excepting those members of the State Congress who, this Government thought, were above all such clandestine and improper approaches, none should be invited. In fact, Government thought that they had already had the opportunity of meeting the Delegation. So the State Congress as a body was ruled out excepting certain people in that party. Apart from the State Congress, in the case of certain other political parties, Government exercised their discretion to invite a certain number of people to Bhaktivilas and to this Chamber. The Parliamentary Delegation never asked either this Government or any other to fix interviews for them. They were at perfect liberty to correspond direct with the people and they did so everywhere else. I have reason to believe that a large number of persons telegraphed to them seeking interviews. They never asked this Government to arrange for a single interview. In those circumstances, this Government could not arrange for an interview. They ought to have come here for lunch at four, but they did not; instead, they came at half-past six.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Then the Delegation themselves suggested that I should give them a general picture of the conditions in the State and I gave them exactly what this Government's view of the State Congress Party is. There is no hiding the fact. The Parliamentary Delegation asked the question—why the State Congress People were not invited to the Legislative Chamber meeting. It was pointed out to them that one or two members of the State Congress were invited, but that they said that Government could not single out one or two members from the party and that therefore they would not be present. In answer to that, Government said that their motives were honourable and commended themselves to Government.

Mr. K. S. Joseph: In view of the serious allegation against the State Congress made by the Head of the Administration, I may be allowed to make a statement.

President: You may make a statement at the end of question time.

Mr. Paul A. Thaliath: May I know why even a single member of the Catholic Community was not invited to meet the Delegation?

Mr. G. Narayanan Tampi: There is no question whatsoever of any particular community being invited. The answer given is clear that such persons as the Government thought might usefully meet the Delegation were invited. That was the only criterion that weighed with Government. There is absolutely no question of communal representation in a matter of this nature.

Mr. K. C. Chandy (*Thodupuzha* cum *Meenachil*): Am I then to understand that there are no members in the Catholic community who could be useful to the Parliamentary Delegation in the discussions?

Mr. G. Narayanan Tampi: The Honourable member is at perfect liberty to draw whatever conclusion he deems fit, but I can assure him that there is no question of community arising in this matter.

Mr. K. S. Joseph: Sir, in comparison with the procedure adopted in this matter in the neighbouring State.....

Mr. G. Narayanan Tampi: Sir, comparisons are odious. Saying that sugar is sweet does not mean that sugar-candy is not also sweet, or even sweeter for that matter.

Mr. K. S. Joseph: I would like the honourable member explaining the statement.....

President: Order, order, Government thought so. What is the explanation for it?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. K. S. Joseph: My question is this :

From the list that is given in appendix I, I see that the majority of the gentlemen who were invited were not members of Legislature. So I put the question, "did Government think that those gentlemen were more useful to Government in the matter of meeting the Parliamentary Delegation than members of Legislature". I want a straight answer.

Mr. G. Narayanan Tampi: Sir, there is no other answer. The Government invited certain persons because they thought they should meet the Parliamentary Delegation.

Mr. K. S. Joseph: I might explain my question further. Looking at the list I find that a large number of people invited are not members of Legislature at present. My question was "is it because Government thought those members would be more useful to Government than members of the Legislature.....

President: Order, order ; it is not a question of more usefulness. The Parliamentary Delegation would have met anybody. The Government came to the conclusion that the Parliamentary Delegation may meet these people some of whom are members of the Legislature. Surely, the honourable member cannot say that there are no useful members outside the Legislature. In fact many members from the Legislature, Mr. T. P. Velayudhan Pillai, Mr. Govindan, Mr. Karunakaran, Mr. Bhaskar, Mr. P. S. Mohamed, Mr. Kesavan Sastri, Sry. Narayani Amma, were invited.

Mr. K. S. Joseph: Why is it that Government did not think it necessary that at least the members who are residents in Trivandrum should be invited ?

Mr. G. Narayanan Tampi: There is no question of why and wherefore. I am afraid the honourable member is obsessed, if I may use the word, with some sort of preconceived notion. There is no question of degrees of usefulness in this matter. All that Government deemed fit was that some of the ladies and gentlemen representing various shades of opinion in Travancore, political or otherwise, should be invited to meet the Delegation. That was what I explained to the Delegation as they were received by me. It was purely a non-official gathering. They were told that they might ask questions and discuss matters with the Parliamentary Delegation. There was no particular implication whatsoever, and I may assure the honourable member on behalf of Government, that no invidious distinction has been made.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Mr. K. S. Joseph: Sir, my question was why those members of the Legislature who are residents of Trivandrum were not invited while those from outside, from places like Alleppey and Chengannoor were invited. There might be some reason. I do not think Government were mad.

President: Order, order. There is a discretion vested with the Government. They deliberately used it.

Opening of new Churches.

202. ***Mr. K. C. Chandy**: Will the Government be pleased to state :

(*a*) the number of applications received from Christians in the years 1114 to the end of the first half year of 1120 for permission to open new Churches and the number of applications allowed ;

(*b*) how many such applications were for permission for opening new Catholic Churches and how many of those were granted ; and

(*c*) the number of applications received from Catholics in the years 1117 to the end of the first half year of 1120, for permission to open cemeteries and how many of such applications were granted ?

Mr. G. Narayanan Tampi:

(*a*)	Number of applications received	193
	Number of applications allowed	57
(*b*)	Number of applications for Catholic Churches	120
	Number of applications granted	38
(*c*)	Number of applications received	8
	Number of applications granted	1

Mr. K. C. Chandy: May I know whether Government did make a statement that more than 20 applications were made ?

Mr. G. Narayanan Tampi: That will be verified.

Mr. N. Narayana Kurup: May I know from the Government whether the total number of Churches in the State exceed at present 2000 ?

Mr. G. Narayanan Tampi: I cannot give the information off hand.

Mr. N. Narayana Kurup: What was it in 1820 when the population was nine lakhs ?

Mr. G. Narayanan Tampi: There is no denying the fact that the number has been rising by leaps and bounds.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly